



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,897	08/04/2003	Michael B. Ball	2703.9US (93-0453.09/US)	5826

24247 7590 03/03/2004

TRASK BRITT
P.O. BOX 2550
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110

EXAMINER

STONER, KILEY SHAWN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/633,897

Applicant(s)

BALL ET AL.

Examiner

Kiley Stoner

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8-4-03.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,671 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application claims attaching which is broader than bonding, so the claims of the instant application are envisioned by 6,604,671 B2. The steps of "maintaining", "attaching", and "disengaging" in the instant application are respectively obvious variants of "retaining", "bonding" and "removing" as claimed in 6,604,671 B2.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,435,400 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

Art Unit: 1725

distinct from each other because the instant application claims attaching which is broader than bonding, so the claims of the instant application are envisioned by 6,435,400 B1. The steps of "maintaining", "attaching", and "disengaging" in the instant application are respectively obvious variants of "retaining", "bonding" and "removing" as claimed in 6,435,400 B1.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,325,275 B1 IDS. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application claims attaching which is broader than bonding, so the claims of the instant application are envisioned by 6,325,275 B1. In addition, it is obvious to position the independently movable clamp over the portion of at least one lead finger in order to clamp more than one finger at a time, thus increasing the efficiency of the process. The steps of "maintaining", "attaching", and "disengaging" in the instant application are respectively obvious variants of "retaining", "bonding" and "removing" as claimed in 6,325,275 B1.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,000,599 IDS. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application claims attaching which is broader than bonding, so the claims of the instant application are envisioned by 6,000,599. In addition, it is obvious to position the independently movable clamp over the portion of at least one lead finger in order to clamp more than one finger at a time,

Art Unit: 1725

thus increasing the efficiency of the process. The steps of "maintaining", "attaching", and "disengaging" in the instant application are respectively obvious variants of "retaining", "bonding" and "removing" as claimed in 6,000,599.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 45-57 of U.S. Patent No. 5,647,528 IDS. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is obvious that the independent clamp in 5,647,528 is provided prior to clamping. The instant application claims attaching which is broader than bonding, so the claims of the instant application are envisioned by 5,647,528. In addition, it is obvious to position the independently movable clamp over the portion of at least one lead finger in order to clamp more than one finger at a time, thus increasing the efficiency of the process. The steps of "maintaining", "attaching", and "disengaging" in the instant application are respectively obvious variants of "retaining", "bonding" and "removing" as claimed in 5,647,528. Finally, the "first independent clamp" and the "second independent clamp" of claim 51 of 5,647,528 meet the limitations of the "first clamp" and "independent clamp" of claim 5 of the instant application.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 114-125 of U.S. Patent No. 5,673,845 IDS. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is obvious that the independent clamps in 5,673,845 are provided prior to clamping. The instant application claims attaching which is broader than bonding, so the claims of the instant application are envisioned by

Art Unit: 1725

5,673,845. In addition, it is obvious to position the independently movable clamp over the portion of at least one lead finger in order to clamp more than one finger at a time, thus increasing the efficiency of the process. The steps of "maintaining", "attaching", and "disengaging" in the instant application are respectively obvious variants of "retaining", "bonding" and "removing" as claimed in 5,673,845. The first and second penetrating clamps of 5,673,845 are independently movable (claim 119). Therefore, claims 114 and 119 meet the limitations of a "first clamp" and an "independent clamp" of claim 5 and a "first independent clamp" and a "second independent clamp" of claim 9 of the instant application.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiley Stoner whose telephone number is (571) 272-1183. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on Monday-Friday at (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1725

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kiley Stoner A.U. 1725

Kiley Stoner 2/25/04